

claims define the claimed invention over the prior art.” Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s contention and, again, traverse this rejection.

The present invention is directed toward a continuous layer of an unfilled pressure-sensitive adhesive on a substrate. The Examiner asserts that EP ‘579 teaches “printing” to form such articles and, thus, printed irregular section adhesive sheets of EP ‘579 fall within the scope of the presently claimed invention. As noted in the last response, the portion of EP ‘579 that refers to “printing” is referring to embodiments where discontinuous adhesive islands or stripes are present in an irregular section adhesive sheet. (See page 2, lines 37-40; page 3, lines 49-53; and Figures 2 and 3) Nowhere is it mentioned that “printing” can be used to form articles other than those according to this distinct embodiment.

Other embodiments disclosed in EP ‘579, where a continuous layer of adhesive is present in an irregular section adhesive sheet are described as being formed by methods “wherein the adhesive sheet is pressed in a previously engraved pressed mold, a method [w]herein the sheet is passed between engraved rolls, or a method wherein the sheet is pressed in a mold or passed between rolls together with a releasing paper” (See page 2, lines 37-40 and Figures 1a and 1b) Again, nowhere does EP ‘579 teach or suggest that “printing” can be used to form articles other than those embodiments having discontinuous adhesive islands or strips present in an irregular section adhesive sheet. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s characterization of EP ‘579, being directed to a completely different type of article – one without a continuous layer of adhesive, as teaching articles of the presently claimed invention is misplaced.

Furthermore, EP ‘579 does not teach or suggest articles of claim 1, wherein the articles comprise a continuous layer of an unfilled pressure-sensitive adhesive, the pressure-sensitive adhesive having a microstructured surface . . . [comprising] a series of features and wherein at least two of three dimensions of each feature . . . are microscopic.” As described on page 2, lines 5-6 of the present application, those surfaces having a “microstructure” are those where the “topical and/or cross-sectional view of the features [is] microscopic.” Clearly, the adhesive surfaces having macroscopic features, which are shown in EP ‘579, would not be understood to be microstructured surfaces.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claims 2-25 and 32-43 ultimately depend from claim 1. Therefore, the same arguments and request apply to those claims as well.

It is respectfully submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, at the below-listed telephone number, if it is believed that prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby.

Registration Number 41,185	Telephone Number (651) 733-9547
Date 12-18-00	

Respectfully submitted,

By

Lisa M. McGeehan
Lisa M. McGeehan

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
P.O. Box 33427
St. Paul, Minnesota 55133-3427
Facsimile: (651) 736-3833